

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD**

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

-

WRIT PETITION No.17172 of 2001

Between:

Mr. Naresh Singh, S/o Late Sri Bajrang Singh, Aged 28 years,
Occ: General Store, R/o H.No.13-2-557, Rahimpura, Puranapul, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

- 1 The State of Andhra Pradesh Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Home Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
- 2 The Comissioner of Police, Purani Haveli, Hyderabad.
- 3 The Station House Officer, Mangalhat Police Station, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ or an order or a direction, declaring the action of the Respondent No.3 of opening a Rowdy Sheet against the petitioner as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional opposed to the principles of Fundamental Rights as well as Human Rights also against Art 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently issue a Rowdy Sheet opened on the name of the petitioner and subsequently return the photographs of the petitioner.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.D.VIJAY

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3: GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The writ petition is filed seeking a Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the third respondent in opening rowdy sheet against the petitioner in Mangalhat Police Station, Hyderabad as illegal and void.

The petitioner is running a general store at Rahimpura, Puranapool, Hyderabad. As the petitioner refused to pay 'mamools' to the third respondent, he deliberately opened rowdy sheet against the petitioner and that he has not involved in any criminal case. It is his case that the third respondent opened rowdy sheet without any valid reason contrary to Order 742 of A.P. Police Standing Orders.

The questions raised in this writ petition are squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in **S. SATYANARAYANA v. STATE OF A.P.**. Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of directing the third respondent to consider the request of the petitioner for closing rowdy sheet following the principles laid down in **SATYANARAYANA's** case (supra), which are as under.

- i. A mere conviction or convictions cannot be thumb rule for opening history sheet or rowdy sheet though history sheet can be opened even without conviction for the limited purpose of watching a person discreetly.
- ii. At the time of opening a history sheet or rowdy sheet a competent officer has to apply mind taking into consideration the social background the proceedings in the criminal trial if a person is convicted and all other relevant material before passing orders for opening history sheet or rowdy sheet.
- iii. A history sheet/rowdy sheet is retained for the period of two years only unless it is ordered to be closed by the Superintendent of Police earlier than two years. During the initial period of two years, the history sheet or rowdy sheet is entitled to request the concerned police officer to close the history sheet or rowdy sheet which has to be considered by the police officer in an objective manner.
- iv. While passing orders for retention of history sheet for another year more, the competent Sub-Divisional Police Officer has to take into consideration the various factors, to wit, surveillance reports, the crime history with reference to the breach of peace of society during the preceding year, the social and political background of the person etc. If there is a preponderance of opinion among the surveillance officers that the person did not come up for any adverse notice and leading a blemishless family life it is a strong circumstance to order for closure of the history sheet or rowdy sheet.
- v. When an order is passed by the competent police officer for retention of the history sheet by simply endorsing on the report/letter of the S.H.O. a single line order, that by itself cannot be a ground to continue the rowdy sheet.
- vi. Any order passed by the Sub-Divisional Police Officer shall have to be supported by reasons. The reasons need not be communicated but to be recorded.

- vii. The orders for opening or retention of history sheet/rowdy sheet are passed under the administrative instructions/guidelines. If such an order is challenged, the competent authority has to place the reasons before the Court which justify retention of history sheet/rowdy sheet. Further, it is always better for the Police Officer to record his own reasons for retention/opening of the history sheet/rowdy sheet.
- viii. In the event as mentioned in conclusion 4.7 it is always open to the Court of judicial review to direct the Sub-Divisional Police Officer to reconsider his decision and pass appropriate orders. But whatever be the events in the guise of opening/retention of history sheet a person's liberty, right to privacy and other freedoms under Article 19 of the Constitution of India cannot be infringed under any circumstances.
- ix. It is to be remembered that any order of the competent police officer which is not supported by reasons is itself unreasonable and arbitrary and can be termed as mala fide in the sense that it is contrary to the purpose for which the Police Officer is authorised under relevant Police Standing Orders. Hence, if the Court comes to the conclusion that the order of the Sub-Divisional Police Officer is contrary to the purpose for which surveillance is authorised, the action shall be set at naught forthwith on the principle that what is unreasonable and unfair is arbitrary and such arbitrary exercise of power amounts to exercising, the power mala fide.

The petitioner is, however, at liberty to approach the third respondent by filing appropriate representation for closing rowdy sheet, if the same is still continued.

The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of. No costs

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

16.06.2005

YS

To

- 1 The State of Andhra Pradesh Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
- 2 The Comissioner of Police, Purani Haveli, Hyderabad.
- 3 The Station House Officer, Mangalhat Police Station, Hyderabad.

4 Two CCs to the Government Pleader for Home, High Court Buildings,
Hyderabad. (OUT)

5 Two CD Copies.